

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

**FOR:**

**Indianapolis Algebra Project**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>		<b>Instruction is clear</b>	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	
<b>Academic Program</b>		<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>	<b>Financial viability</b>	
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<b>Student/instructor ratio: 4-1:1</b>	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>		

*(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Indianapolis Algebra Project's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).*

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Indianapolis Algebra Project  
**REVIEWER:** S.T.

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 12/18/07

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	-Sign-in Sheets -Training Presentation (for Evansville) -Training dates -Instructor information packet		<b>X</b>	-Documentation of professional development opportunities and tutor attendance is adequate; -Training presentation and Instructor information packet include a thorough explanation of IAP's expectations for tutors as well as references to IDOE Policies and Procedures for SES and is line with content of provider's application.
Progress Reporting	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Progress reports -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	-Progress reports -Progress report timeline		<b>X</b>	-Progress reports are clear and user friendly; -Progress reports include student objectives, assessment results, and updates on goal attainment and achievement; -Progress reports are submitted in accordance to timeframe agreed to in SES Contracts with districts.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.	-Explanation of process for learning plan development -Assessment scores and learning plan s -Explanation regarding how assessments correlate with Indiana standards -Examples of pre and post -tests		<b>X</b>	-Learning plan development process is appropriate; - Individual learning plans submitted are clear, address student skill gaps and academic standards; -Individual Learning Plan implementation is supported by progress report documentation; - Demonstration of Pre and post-test assessment correlation to Indiana academic standards is clear.

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Indianapolis Algebra Project  
**SITE:** Abraham Lincoln Elementary & Garfield Elementary  
**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** S.H. & Room B24 Tutors  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 3

**DATE:** 12/10/07 & 12/13/07  
**REVIEWER:** S.T. & M.C.  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:55 p.m. & 4:40 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		-3 Lessons were observed; In Lesson 1 , two students worked with a tutor on division problems; In Lesson 2, a student worked with a tutor on a math worksheet and manipulatives focused on congruency; In Lesson 3, a group of 4 students played a “Math” tic-tac-toe game practicing understanding improper fractions; -Lessons adequately match the original description in the provider application; As per the application, inquiry-based learning, cooperative learning, and inter-active/small group instruction were observed.
Instruction is clear			X		-Instruction was clear; -Tutors appropriately communicated to students what is to be learned; -Tutors adjusted instruction or used modified correction when necessary; -Tutors guided instruction by referencing appropriate math rules or previous lessons when students had difficulty providing correct answers.
Time on task is appropriate			X		-Students were engaged with lessons and responded well to their tutors when asked to provide answers; -Tutors adequately utilized strategies that promote student time on task.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X		-Tutors demonstrated appropriate knowledge of material being covered during lessons and good understanding of how to implement provider’s program; -Tutors demonstrated an appropriate knowledge of effective tutoring strategies and techniques.
Student/instructor ratio: 4:1; 1:1, & 2:1			X		- Student/instructor ratio matched that reported in the original provider application; one on one or small group instruction was observed at all site visit locations.